3/26/72

Dear Larry,

There are a few minutes before we see ~~xxxx~~ how BBC sees The Last of the Mohicans, so let me amplify a bit on our discussion earlier today.

The guy I interviewed in N.O. who I knew and thus there was nor reluctances on his part in admitting had flown for the CIA in the Congo is Frank Bartes. There are other interesting things about him, not beginning with his unsuccessful effort to bribe Castro. He was quite wealthy for Cuba, I suspect by inheriting a railroad. I don't think he can make anything on his own. Now his name is in Oswald's ddress book, but one would never know it from the Warren Commission. Oswald made his simple change in names that is characteristic of a simple code he seems to have used and the FBI then made a real charge to make it unrecognizable in typing it up for the Commission. I'll be going into this and more in AG IN OSWALD. Bartes dresses like a movie character, soy movie. Handsome man in physical attractiveness only. What is also interesting is that for some unexplained reason the FBI checked the Doubl-Chek Corp on Oswald in N.O. You spoke of Whitten's telling you of a recruiting office in Baltimore and I told you the Agency had them all over. I had not known that Doubl-Chek had offices outside B'ham and perhaps Miami. But you ask why would they recruit mercenary flyers in Balt/? Let me answer with a question: why did they in B'ham? They do their things their way, and this part they do well. They know what they are doing. They also used to have contract employees, short-term stuff (I think upper limit 60 days) that supposedly didn't require security checking. Hanes, for example, had a DIA contract. I have never checked into what he did, when or for how long.

In analyzing the phrase from Hoover's report to the Committee, I was too hasty and didn't include enough:"...examination of all the submitted samples..." I pointed out how the use of "all" can, whether or not intended, result in deception or exaggeration yet in the sense of use be strictly accurate; that he can interpret "submitted" to have special meaning later, i.e., he didn't have all he should have and he was saying it this way. Together these words would make the average reader believe he had 100% and he could later interpret it to mean he was specifying he didn't have 100%. I omitted an important thing, "examination". He fails in what - have seen quoted to either say or in any meaningful way even hint at what examination or examinations. The only indicated one is chemical, and that is the least significant of all those possible if, in fact, even relevant. I won't go into all the tests until I see the full texts of Hoover and ITT statements.

After we spoke it came out that Beard denied confirming to Hume. I can't imagine him making a mistake on this or lyingabout it. The question next is did she? Would she dare, or was she confused and so upset when he interviewed her that she doesn't recall what she said? If you want to toy with fictional approaches in thinking, could she have been hypnotized? She had a recording device connected to her heart action, so I doubt, with it making a graph, if it is something she'd have risked, that is, deliberate lying.

There is much old stuff on the old, before-conglomerates ITT in the left-wing and radical press of the 30s. As I told you, this Chile thing is anything but new. They did it all over Latin America, esp Caribbean area, in those days, as did other US corporations. U.S.Fruit record well known....Glad to know Anderson is working on my Vogeler tip even if he didn't respond. The easiest way I can think of for you to locate the ref to him in Time (or Newsweek) is to ask their local office if it can tell you when the pub. mentioned himthe year or/and the year after his release without telling them why. If they have a clerk check index cards, they may not know in responding what they are responding to. But if you have no desire to do your own story on it, tell them right out why. Or, if you do it when they have just gone to press, no sweat.

There is seeming conflict between the Hoover and ITT statements. There may, on close reading, actually be none. Few of them will tackle the old bastard. If there is a real conflict, I would regard it as exceptional and possibly significant. He sure went out of his way to help ITT in what he omitted that should be obvious to a correspondence-school dick. And so many silent criminal lawyers, prosecutors, private dicks, etc. Not only the major papers are uptight on this.

If your Wash office files any copy that differs in any details from what is on the other wires, I'd appreciate knowing what they say. Best egards,